

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has obtained a translation of the Abstract cited by the Examiner and attaches that Abstract and translation to the present amendment as part of the Applicant's duty of disclosure. The Applicant has not verified the accuracy of the translation and the Examiner is encouraged to continue to rely on independent materials with respect to this prosecution.

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to incorporate the limitation that at least one balancing weight moves parallel to the axis of gantry rotation. This is not taught by the Yokogawa reference which appears to describe only balancing weights that move within the plane of rotation (i.e. radially with respect to the axis of rotation). In light of this amendment, the rejection of claims 1 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is respectfully traversed.

New claims 20-22 describe a system in which weights may be moved in two directions. Such a mechanism is also not disclosed in the Yokogawa reference. Accordingly, claims 20-23 are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Yokogawa does not teach the problem of out-of-plane imbalance and thus there is no teaching suggestion for a modification of the Yokogawa device to meet the limitation of claims 1-19. With respect to claims 7 and 20-22, Yokogawa clearly shows a single axis for movement of each weight and makes no teaching suggestion for moving a single weight along multiple axes per the present invention.

In light of these amendments and comments, it is believed that claims 1 through, 7, and 15 through 23 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW A. HALSMER

By: 

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719